

REMARKS

The remarks presented herein have been previously submitted (23 March 2006). In response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment, Applicants hereby submit amendments to the specification in the proper manner as listed above.

Claims 8-11, 30-32, 35 and 40-52 are pending in the application. Claims 41, 42 and 44-52 have been withdrawn with claim 51 having been amended and claims 8-10, 30-32, 35 and 40 having been amended by the foregoing amendment. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's consideration, and making a record, of documents submitted in Information Disclosure Statements (IDS).

The drawings stand objected to for including reference character(s) S7 of Figure 3 not being mentioned in the description and for not including reference sign(s) 24, 89 and 550 in Figure 4 that were mentioned in the description.

In replacement paragraph on page 22, reference is made to S7. Figure 4 has been amended to remove reference characters that have been used to designate multiple parts. Figure 6 has also been amended Character 24 has been relabeled as 425 on substitute page number 26, line 15. Character 89 is included in Figure 2b and character 550 has been relabeled as 455 in Figure 4.

No new matter has been introduced as a result of the relabeling of Figures 4 and 6; entry of these Substitute Sheets (previously submitted) representing amended Figures 4 and 6 is requested.

The specification has been amended to conform to the relabeling of the various reference characters in Figure 4 as well as to overcome the objections raised in the Office Action. No new matter has been introduced into the application by the attached substitute specification sheets. Entry of the Amendments to the Specification is also requested. It is believed that the Amendments to the Specification overcome the objections of the disclosure.

Similarly, the Abstract has been amended by the attached (previously submitted) Substitute Abstract to overcome the objections raised in the Office Action. Again, no new matter has been introduced into the application by the Substitute Abstract and Applicants respectfully request entry of the Substitute Abstract.

Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the objections to the drawings, the specification, the claims and the abstract.

It is believed that objections to claim 8 have also been overcome by the foregoing amendment and Applicants request withdrawal of this objection as well.

Claims 8, 30, 31, 35 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,865,829 (Kitajima). Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitajima. Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitajima in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,371,908 (Furosawa). Claim 32 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitajima in view of JP 10325798A (Imaizumi). Applicants request traversal of this rejection for the following reasons.

Exemplary embodiments disclose plural images of the object region being sequentially detected. Amended claim 8 recites, *inter alia*, an image memory for storing a set of first image

data representing plural images of the object region sequentially detected by the first camera during at least a time duration and a display system configured to sequentially display plural second representation generated from at least a subset of the set of first image data such that the plural second representations are displayed in superposition with the first representation for observation by a user.

Plural second representations generated from the stored image data are sequentially displayed by the display system (somewhat like a video clip) and they are displayed in superposition with the first representation (the visible light image) for observation by the user.

Kitajima discloses (in Figure 8 and at col. 9, line 53) an image memory 160, 161 for storing a plurality of images (frame memories a, b, c, etc.). One image stored in the memory (current image) is displayed on a monitor 67 or LED display 93.

Kitajima simply fails to disclose a plurality of stored images being displayed as a sequence of plural images. The plurality of frame memories in Kitajima appear to be used for archival purposes.

Furthermore, if the image generated by LED display 93 is to be displayed to the user through oculars, quick return half mirror 81 has to be switched to its position shown in solid lines in Figure 8 such that the other beam path for providing the visible light image to the oculars is blocked by mirror 81. If the quick return half mirror 81 is switched to the position shown by the dashed line in Figure 8, the visible light image of the object is provided to the oculars, but it appears impossible for the user to perceive the image generated by the LED display. It does not appear possible for a representation displayed by the display system to be displayed in

superposition with the first representation provided by the second beam path as recited in claim 8.

Kitajima fails disclose or suggest displaying plural images generated from the first beam path as a sequence and in superposition with the magnified first representation generated by the second beam path. Kitajima fails to anticipate Applicants' invention as recited in claim 8.

At least for these reasons, it is believed claim 8 is allowable over Kitajima. Claims 9-11, 30-32 and 43, all of which depend in allowable claim 8 are also allowable at least based on their dependence. In addition, Furosawa and Imaizumi fail to overcome the deficiencies of Kitajima highlighted above.

Claim 35 similarly recites recording a series of images during a time duration (sequence) and displaying the recorded series superimposed with the first representation. Claim 35 is also allowable over Kitajima.

Claim 40 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by *Near-Infrared Indocyanine Green Video Angiography* (Raabe). Claim 40 also stands rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over WO01/22870A1 (Chari) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,721, 590 (Ohishi).

The subject matter of claim 40 is entirely attributable to Andreas Raabe. Therefore, the Raabe article does not qualify as a 102(a) reference.


Claim 40 has also been amended to recite assessing a complete blocking of the aneurysm sac with the clip based on the at least one fluorescence image. Chari and Ohishi fail to disclose assessing complete blocking of the aneurysm sag based on the fluorescence image.

Claim 40 is allowable over the cited documents.

All of the rejections having been overcome, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions with respect to expediting the prosecution of this application, he is urged to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Potomac Patent Group PLLC

By: 

Krishna Kalidindi
Registration No. 41,461

P.O. Box 0855
McLean, VA 22101-0855
703-893-8500

Date: June 26, 2006